DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 717 CS 206 175

AUTHOR Gere, Anne Ruggles; And Others
TITLE Measuring Teacher Attitudes toward Instruction in Writing.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Correlation; Educational Research; Individual Development; Nature Nurture Controversy; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Writing Apprehension

ABSTRACT

Data were obtained from 311 teachers in order to sample a wide domain of attitudes toward writing instruction and writing anxiety. The subjects' responses were organized along four attitudinal dimensions: (1) the importance of standard English in writing instruction (SE), (2) the importance of defining and evaluating writing tasks (DE), (3) the importance of student self-expression in writing instruction (SEx), and (4) the importance of linguistic maturity in writing instruction (LM). The positive correlations between DE and both LM and SEx, coupled with the negative correlations between DE and both LM and SEx suggested that the four scales fell into two subgroups that identified discrete teacher characteristics. Teachers who scored high in the SE/DE subgroup agreed strongly with items concerning correctness, usage, and forms; and they viewed evaluation as a means of assuring adherence to these items. In contrast, teachers who scored high in the LM/SEx subgroup agreed strongly with items emphasizing the importance of experience, exploration, personal relationships, and individual development. These two subgroups bear a direct relationship to Barry Kroll's designations of writing instructors as interventionists and maturationists, designations that correspond to the competing theories of nature versus nurture in human development. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Anne Ruggles Gere
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED199717

Measuring Teacher Attitudes Toward Instruction in Writing

Anne Ruggles Gere, Brian F. Schuessler, and
Robert D. Abbott

It has become commonplace for discussions of research in composition to lament the primitive state of knowledge in the field. If research in composition is underdeveloped, research in the effectiveness of writing instruction is even more afflicted. One theme of research in teacher instructional effectiveness is the assumption that teacher attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors influence student achievement. Indeed, at least three studies in this collection, in addition to this one, demonstrate this theme. Koziol's investigation of practices and policies; Witte, Daly and Faigley's assessment of college composition instruction; and Carroll's study of the effects of teacher knowledge all, although they ask different questions and employ different methodology, proceed from the assumption that teachers' knowledge, behavior or attitudes influence student writing performance directly.

Brownell (1948) was among the first to suggest criteria for teacher effectiveness research, and his suggestions have been echoed by educational researchers of succeeding generations. According to Mitzel (1960), who developed Brownell's concepts, the three criteria for teacher effectiveness research are: 1) presage variables (teacher personality, knowledge, status characteristics); 2) process variables (classroom activites) and 3) product variables (primarily measures of pupil change).

CS206175

Using this model, Cantrell (1977) demonstrated that student achievement was higher with teachers who were highly knowledgeable, verbally positive and non-authotitarian.

Similar research in the effectiveness of writing instruction cannot proceed without reliable instruments. Instruments described by Koziol and by Witte, Daly and Faigley address the behavior of writing teachers, while this study describes the use of an instrument designed to measure the attitudes of writing teachers. Existing measures of writing teachers' attitudes lack both rational and empirical validity. The "Knowledge and Attitude in Written Composition, Test B" (Jacob & Evans, 1969) elicits attitudes with respect to emphasis on form and emphasis on content. Lin's (1974) survey measures three dimensions of teacher attitudes toward language function. The Attitude Scale: Writers and Writing (Blake, 1976) measures attitudes toward skills of writing, varieties of writing and kinds of writers. An essay questionnaire developed by Klinger (1977) measures teacher attitudes toward errors in writing. These instruments lack rational validity because they fail to address the full range of instructional approaches in composition programs (NCTE, 1972), and they lack empirical validity because they provide little evidence of convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

Method.

In order to sample a wide domain of attitudes toward the instruction of writing, items from the "Composition Opinionnaire" (NCTE, 1971) were grouped into a questionnaire. Items of the opinionnaire which did not conform to rules for stating items in attitude scales (Nunnally, 1978) were rewritten or discarded if their content overlapped with other

items. These items were originally developed by a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English and were designed to sample salient dimensions in the instruction of writing. The final questionnaire consisted of 47 items on composition instruction and the 26-item Writing Anxiety Scale (Daly & Miller, 1975). Subjects expressed an attitude on a 5 point Likert-type scale anchored by: (1) disagree, (2) disagree, (3)no opinion, (4)agree and (5)strongly agree. The content of the items was distributed throughout the questionnaire. The questionnaire and a self-addressed stampted return envelope were mailed to 675 members of the Washington State Council of Teachers of English.

Results

Data were obtained from 311 of the questionnaires which were returned. Many respondents added comments to their questionnaires indicating their interest in this project. One hundred subjects were male, 198 were female, and 13 did not indicate their gender. The mean age of the subjects was 41.5 years and the man number of years teaching English was 12.74. Thirty-five elementary, 227 secondary, 13 community college and 33 college or university teachers completed questionnaires.

Based upon rational consturct definitions, earlier research (Schuessler, Gere & Abbott, In Press) and the intercorrelations of the responses to the items, scales were developed. This was an iterative process which resulted in four scales of 10 items each. The four scales were named: 1) Attitudes toward the importance of Standard English in the instruction of writing (Standard English); 2) Attitudes toward the importance of defining and evaluating writing tasks in the instruction of writing (Define and Evaluate); 3) Attitudes toward the importance of student self-expression in the instruction of writing (Self Expression). 4)

Attitudes toward the importance of linguistic maturity in the instruction of writing (Linguistic Maturity). Table I lists the items in each scale, the mean, and standard deviation of ratings for these items. High scores on items represent agreement, and low scores represent disagreement.

[Insert Table I about here]

Table II indicates sample sizes, mean scores, standard deviation, and Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for each of the four scales. Here again high scores on the scales represent agreement, and low scores represent disagreement. All analyses in this paper are based upon all available data. Failure to rate specific items accounts for differing sample sizes. However, no systematic tendencies to omit certain items were noted.

Insert table II about here

Scores on each of the four scales were intercorrelated, and these correlations among scales are shown in Table III. Interpretation of these correlations indicates that the scale scores are relatively independent and thus are not measuring a unidimensional attitude. The degree of convergent and discriminant validity was investigated further by correlating a student's response to an item with a score based upon all the other items in the scale. These item-remainder correlations are shown in Column r of Table 1. If we interpret response to a single item as a separate measure of the attitude, then the correlation between responses to the item and response to the remainder of the scale can be interpreted in terms of convergent validitiy of item and scale.

Insert Table III about here

Because means, standard deviations and Cronbach alphas for various subgroups differed significantly, responses were also analyzed separately for teaching level, gender and years of teaching English. Scale means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for males and females are shown in Table IV; the same for elementary, secondary, community college, and university teachers are shown in Table VI; for teachers with less than six or more than nineteen years of experience this information appears in Table VIII. Tables V,VII, and IX report the scale intercorrelations for various groups.

Insert Tables IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX about here

Discussion

One of the functions of a correlational study such as this is to contribute to theory-building about teacher attitudes. The positive correlation between Standard English (SE) and Defined and Evaluate (DE) and between Linguistic Maturity (LM) and Self Expression (SEx) coupled with the negative correlations between, for example DE and LM or SEx (see Table III) suggests that the four scales fall into two subgroups which identify discrete teacher characteristics. Teachers who score high in the SE/DE subgroup agree strongly with items concerning correctness, usage, and forms. They see evaluation as a means of assuring adherence to these. In contrast, teachers who score high in the LM/SEx subgroup agree strongly with items emphasizing the importance of experience, exploration, personal relationships and individual development.

These two subgroups bear a direct relationship to the two paradigms identified in Kroll's (1980) discussion of composition instruction. According to Kroll, the two competing theories of human development--"nature" and "nurture"--underlie most composition instruction. Interventionists, following the nurture principle, emphasize the content and agent of instruction, text-centered evaluation, comprehensive error marking, and tightly controlled assignments. Teachers in the interventionist mode, according to Kroll, focus on "such topics as standard usage, sentence structure . . . paragraph structure (methods of development), and written conventions (punctuation and mechanics)." (p. 744) An interventionist program "places priority on teaching the basic skills which the students lack, assuming that once students acquire control of such skills their written products will show marked improvement, and therefore, their self-esteem as writers will improve as a matter of course." (p. 750).

Maturationists, on the other hand, follow the "nature" principle and emphasize personal writing, "writing centered on the experiences and emotions of the students and aimed at fostering personal growth." (p. 746) Further, maturationists conceptualize writing as artistic expression, focus on the process of composing, and try to enable students to experience that process rather than to impart specific knowledge or skills as interventionists do. Evaluation for the maturationist is context-centered. "A student's paper is judged in the context of that student's intentions, effort, and past performance....[and overlooks] many specific errors because they are trivial features of a composition and tell little about an individual writer's progress in sincere, self-confident expression." (p. 750). A maturationist writing program "focuses on the self-confidence of the students, assuming that only when these

writers are able to engage freely in the process of composing will they produce the quantities of writing necessary for improvement." (p. 751).

Kroll's categories, based upon careful examination of educational philosophy and upon close observation of composition instruction, are the theoretical counterpart of the two statistical subgroups identified in this study. Comparison of Kroll's description of the maturationist paradigm with items in SEx/LM subgroup reveals parallel attributes. Likewise, items in the DE/SE subgroup parallel Kroll's description of the interventionist paradigm of composition instruction. This correlation between composition theory and subgroups identified by statistical evaluation of this opinionnaire suggests that this opinionnaire can contribute to the development of theories about the relationship between teacher attributes and student achievement.

While the identification of these subgroups and their correspondence with theoretical paradigms is significant, we must also determine that the two scales within each subgroup identify different qualities or the scales have no discriminant validity. While SEx and IM scales appear to identify similar attributes, close rational examination suggests that their statistical independence is matched by a theoretical one. For instance, experience and drama figure in the SEx scale while language itself or "talk" is more important in the LM scale. The SEx scale's emphasis on growth through exploration and experiences has much in common with Moffett's (1968) views on the development of writing abilities. Moffett urges the importance of drama and experimentation for young writers. Two items in the SEx scale mention elementary students specifically, and a number of others refer to developing writers and their need for exploration.

The two items (#4 and 5) which have the highest intra-scale correlation in the LM scale both describe students' language use in relation to

others. This suggests one of the differences between the SEx and LM scales. Items in the LM scale refer more frequently to language in relation to others whereas those in the SEx scale refer more to language for the self. In Moffett's terms, SEx items describe egocentric uses of language while the LM scale describes more decentered language. Thus, we can say that the two scales within the maturationist subgroup do identify different qualities.

Differences between the SE and DE scales of the interventionist subgroup are more immediately apparent. Although both are concerned with the content of a composition course rather than with the student, they address different aspects of that content. Items in the SE scales deal with issues of form and usage while those in the DE scale speak to the teacher's responsibilities for assessing writing. Thus from both an empirical and rational perspective, we can claim that the four discrete scales in this opinionnaire can contribute to studying teacher attitudes toward writing instruction.

Although the four scales measure discrete attributes, they are not monolithic. As Table VII indicates, the negative correlation between SE and SEx decreases from university to secondary to elementary teachers which suggests that the two constructs are more distinct for teachers at higher levels of education than are teachers in the elementary school.

Just as the opinion scales are not monolithic, so the mean scores on anxiety Scale (AS) varies with groups and in its correlation with other scales. As Table VI indicates, the mean AS score for secondary and university teachers goes in the direction of decreasing for teachers at higher levels although the difference is not statistically significant. Likewise, as Table IV shows, mean AS scores for men and women go in the

direction of higher writing anxiety for women than men although the difference lacks statistical significance.

One explanation for this difference in writing anxiety for men and women emerges when we consider the correlations between AS and SE. For men this correlation is not significant ($r=.07$, $p>.05$) but for women it is significant ($r=.40$, $p<.05$). This correlation suggests that women's anxiety about writing may be tied to their concern for issues of form and usage. Research (Gilley and Summers, 1970; Barron, 1971; Lakov, 1973; Kramer, 1974; Thorne and Henley, 1975) indicates differences between the language of men and women, and analysis of these differences (Ritchie, 1972) indicates that women are more sensitive than males to linguistic indicators of lower status and are less likely to use syntactic features with such connoations. This sensitivity to appropriate usages may derive, as Lakov (1975) suggests, from the fact that women's position in society depends upon how others view her. "She must dress decoratively, look attractive, be compliant, if she is to survive at all in the world. Then her overattention to appearance and appearances (including, perhaps overcorrectness and over gentility of speech and etiquette) is merely the result of being forced to exist only as a reflection in the eyes of others." (p. 27). Thus the sociological forces which shape women's peeceptions of themselves and the language they use may contribute to the anxiety about writing and the related concern with Standard English demonstrated by women in this study. Other data (Campbell & Williamson, 1973) indicates that teachers may reduce their anxiety by becoming more dogmatic, and a relationship between anxiety and dogmatisim is evident in the correlation between AS and SE scales. For female teachers at least, recourse to the dogmatism of rules for standard forms and usage

may help reduce anxiety about writing.

Implications

Among the implications of this study are these:

1) The two paragims identified by Kroll describe the attitudes of practicing teachers accurately. If teachers are to accept the interactionist paradigm which Kroll recommends, more attention must be given to teacher attitudes.

2) Differences in agreement with a particular scale according to gender, teaching level or years of experience suggest the importance of considering demographic subgroups in examinations of teacher attitudes. In cases where subgroups differ, the relationship between scale scores may be

3) Because this study focuses on attitudes only, it indicates little about teacher behaviors. Research (Schuman and Johnson, 1976) indicates that the degree of generality of a statement influences the types of behavior which can be predicted. While items in this study are closer to what Fishbein (1975) defines as statements of behavioral intention than to traditional attitude measures, they still may not predict teacher behavior in a specific situation. Therefore, presage variables such as the ones identified in this study must be combined with process and product varaibles to provide a complete picture of writing instruction.

References

Barron, N. Sex-typed language: the production of grammatical cases. Acta Sociologica 1971, 14, 24-27.

Blake, R.W. Assessing English and language arts teachers' attitudes toward writers and writing. The English Record, 1976, 27, 87-97.

Brownwell, W.A. Criteria for learning in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 1948, 18, 106-112.

Campbell, D.T. & Fiske, D.W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the mutitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

Campbell, L.P. & Williamson, J.A. Dogmatism in student teachers. Educational Forum, 1973, 37, 481-489.

Cantrell, R.P., Stenner, A.J. & Katzenmeyer, W.G. Teacher knowledge, attitudes, and classroom teaching correlates of student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 172-179.

Daly, J.A. & Miller, M.D. The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 242-248.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. Relief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior. Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley, 1975.

Gilley, H.M. and Summers, C.S. Sex differences in the use of hostile verbs, Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76, 33-37.

Gleser, G.C., Gottschalk, L.A. & Watkins, J. The relationship of sex and intelligence to choice of words: a normative study of verbal behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 182-191.

Jacob, P.H. and Evans, W.H. Illinois Tests in the Teaching of High School English. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969, U.S. Office of Education Project Number HE-145.

Key, M.R. Linguistic behavior of male and female, Linguistics, 1972, 88, 15-31.

Klinger, G.C. A campus view of college writing. College Composition and Communication, 1977, 28, 343-347.

Kramer, C. Women's speech: separate but unequal? Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1974, 61, 14-24.

Kroll, B.M. Developmental perspectives and the teaching of composition. College English, 1980, 41, 741-752.

Lakoff, R. Language and Women's Place. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Lin, C.C. The Analysis of Teachers' Attitudes toward Students' Writing. Ph.D. Dissertation, Rutgers University, 1974.

Mitzel, H.E. Teacher effectiveness. In C.W. Harris (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Moffet, J. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

National Council of Teachers of English. Composition Opinionnaire. Urbana, IL: NCTE Commission of Composition, 1971.

National Council of Teachers of English. The Student's Right to Write. Urbana, IL: NCTE Commission of Composition, 1972. (ED 068 938).

Nunnally, J. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill, 1978.

Schuessler, B., Gere, A.R., Abbott, R.D. The Rational and Empirical Development of Four Scales Measuring Teacher Attitudes toward Written Composition: A Preliminary Investigation. Research in the Teaching of English. In Press.

Thorne, B. and Henley, N. (Eds.) Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1975.

Table I

Items in Each Scale, Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD)

of Item Responses, and the Correlation (r) Between

The Item and Its Scale Excluding the Item

The Importance of Standard English in

the Instruction of Written Composition

(M)	(SD)	(r)	Item
1.81	.93	.40	1) In order to avoid errors in sentence structure, weak students should be encouraged to write only short, simple sentences.
1.54	.82	.34	2) High school students should be discouraged from using figurative language because their efforts at metaphor so often produce only cliches.
2.22	1.14	.44	3) Students should not be allowed to begin sentences with and, or, for, or but.
2.40	1.13	.43	4) Students should be discouraged from using the first person pronoun in their composition.
3.03	1.30	.12	5) The English course for junior high school should include a research paper so that students can learn how to sue the library and source materials for papers in their own courses.
2.75	1.21	.30	6) Correct English is established by logical grammatical relationships within the language.
2.71	1.15	.42	7) Students' oral languge should be corrected so that the forms will appear in their writing.
1.49	.84	.17	8) High school students who are able to consistently write correct English should not be required to do further work in composition.
2.64	1.26	.43	9) Students should be required to prepare written outlines before they begin writing expository papers.
2.49	1.18	.26	10) There is little research evidence that knowledge of grammar and usage will produce improvement in student writing.*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Importance of Defining and Evaluating Writing Tasks

in the Instruction of Written Composition

(M)	(SD)	(r)	Item
2.04	.99	.47	1) Successful writing is achieved only if all themes are carefully corrected by the teacher.
1.90	.99	.48	2) Grades are the most effective way of motivating students to improve their writing.
2.96	1.29	.42	3) The major obligation of instruction in composition is to help students learn and practice the convention of standard, educated English.
1.75	.90	.46	4) Every error on a students compostion should be indicated.
2.82	1.05	.27	5) Assignments during the last two years of high school should require primarily expository writing.
2.24	1.02	.30	6) Rhetoric as it is pertinent to the composition course concerns only the manner of writing or speaking, not the matter.
1.90	.99	.60	7) Grades are the most effective way of evaluating compositions.
2.15	1.08	.34	8) Students should rewrite each paper regardless of the number or kind of errors.
3.53	1.14	.23	9) By the time they leave high school all students should be able to distinguish clearly among the four forms of discourse: narration, description, exposition, and argumentation.
1.87	.94	.06	10) The major purpose of evaluating compositions is to guide individual student growth and development.*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(M)	(SD)	(r)	Item
3.13	1.12	.29	1) Teachers should write all compositions they assign to students.
2.10	1.04	.16	2) Compositions written in class should never be given letter grades.
2.80	.98	.20	3) Growth in written self-expression depends in part upon a wide range of first-hand experiences.
3.43	1.07	.33	4) Composition programs in the elementary grades should be directed primarily at encouraging students to self-expression.
4.43	.84	.12	5) Writing assignments should be more extensive than the specification of a topic or list of topics.
3.58	1.09	.33	6) Composition programs in the elementary grades should be designed primarily to help students learn to discipline their writing and develop awareness of accepted standards of good prose.*
2.66	1.13	.35	7) Teachers should correct errors on students' papers.*
2.87	1.19	.32	8) Strict conformity to rules of Standard English inhibits student growth in writing.
3.23	1.08	.27	9) Students given freedom in composing will discover various types of writing for themselves.
3.95	.91	.34	10) Creative dramatization, role playing, and pantomime have little effect on written composition.*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Importance of Linguistic Maturity in the

Instruction of Written Composition

(M)	(SD)	(r)	Item
4.02	.83	.35	1) The experience of composing can and should nurture the pupils' quest for self-realization and his need to relate constructively to his peers.
4.52	.70	.35	2) The teacher-pupil conference can and should aid the learner in finding his strengths and encourage him in correcting some of his weaknesses.
4.04	1.14	.17	3) The techniques of writing and documenting a formal research paper should be taught in high school to all college-bound students.
3.67	.97	.27	4) Students should have freedom in selecting the topics for their compositions.
3.54	1.12	.09	5) Differing teaching approaches must be used for teaching factual writing or objectively oriented writing and for teaching subjectively-oriented imaginative material.
4.29	.94	.29	6) Growth in writing in the elementary school is enhanced by a broad and rich program of literature.
3.85	.86	.25	7) Students should often "talk out" their compositions prior to the writing.
3.67	1.04	.12	8) Able pupils tend to explore different forms and styles of expression and show more variation in quality from one written product to another than do less able pupils.
3.99	1.15	.10	9) Grading a paper or a course with a single letter grade informs no one as to the values sought whether those of style, content, mechanical accuracy or a combination of these elements.
3.06	.99	.16	10) Students who speak freely, fluently, and effectively are generally good writers.

*Item responses are reversed in scoring these items.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE II

NUMBER OF TEACHERS (N), MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR FOUR TEN-ITEM SCALES OF TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD INSTRUCTION IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION

SCALE NAME	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ALPHA
STANDARD ENGLISH	277	23.12	5.51	.66
DEFINING AND EVALUATING WRITING TASKS	286	23.14	5.44	.70
STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	283	33.11	4.80	.60
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	290	38.80	4.15	.49

TABLE III

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SCALES BASED ON TOTAL SAMPLE

	STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINING AND EVALUATING WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION
STANDARD ENGLISH	1.00		
DEFINING AND EVALUATING WRITING TASKS	.58	1.00	
STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	-.42	-.49	1.00
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	.04	-.17	.25

TABLE IV

SCALE MEANS (M), STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD), AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) FOR MALES AND FEMALES SEPARATELY

		STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
MALE	M	22.41	23.44	32.31	38.35	47.58
	SD	5.50	5.46	4.82	3.42	10.92
	N	97	105	101	102	99
FEMALE	M	23.47	23.02	33.66	39.02	49.51
	SD	5.49	5.45	4.85	4.51	14.80
	N	177	176	178	184	181

TABLE V

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SCALES FOR MALES AND FEMALES SEPARATELY[a]

	STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
STANDARD ENGLISH	1.00	.56	-.43	-.02	.40
DEFINE & EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	.62	1.00	-.49	-.24	.22
SELF-EXPRESSION	-.47	-.50	1.00	.31	-.21
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	.16	-.03	.12	1.00	-.33
ANXIETY	.07	-.17	.04	-.36	1.00

[a]CORRELATIONS FOR MALES ARE BELOW DIAGONAL AND CORRELATIONS FOR FEMALES ARE ABOVE DIAGONAL.

TABLE VI

SCALES MEANS (M), STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD), AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) FOR ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

		SCALES				
		STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
ELEMENTARY	M	22.81	20.83	35.76	39.00	47.23
	SD	3.75	3.62	3.92	4.14	10.89
	N	31	35	34	34	34
SECONDARY	M	23.75	23.79	32.74	38.80	49.83
	SD	5.56	5.52	4.84	4.29	14.19
	N	208	207	207	213	207
COMMUNITY COLLEGE	M	21.30	22.38	33.46	37.54	45.20
	SD	6.23	4.96	5.03	2.63	13.45
	N	10	13	13	13	12
UNIVERSITY	M	19.43	21.97	32.52	39.13	44.52
	SD	5.04	5.97	5.38	3.68	10.77
	N	28	30	29	31	31

TABLE VII

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SCALES SEPARATELY BY LEVEL OF TEACHING

A: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY[a]

	STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
STANDARD ENGLISH	1.00	.49	-.10	.18	.04
DEFINE & EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	.56	1.00	-.35	-.15	-.09
SELF-EXPRESSION	-.45	-.43	1.00	.36	-.08
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	.03	-.19	.25	1.00	-.43
ANXIETY	.30	.13	-.13	-.34	1.00

[a]NOTE - CORRELATIONS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS ARE ABOVE DIAGONAL AND CORRELATIONS FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS ARE BELOW DIAGONAL

B: COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY[b]

	STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
STANDARD ENGLISH	1.00	.60	-.42	.27	.60
DEFINE & EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	.80	1.00	-.74	-.39	-.02
SELF-EXPRESSION	-.64	-.76	1.00	.03	.04
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	.08	-.02	.30	1.00	.20
ANXIETY	.19	-.10	-.13	-.38	1.00

[b]NOTE - CORRELATIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS ARE ABOVE DIAGONAL AND CORRELATIONS FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS ARE BELOW DIAGONAL

TABLE VIII

SCALE MEANS (M), STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD), AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) FOR LESS EXPERIENCED (LESS THAN 6 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH) AND MORE EXPERIENCED (MORE THAN 19 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH) SECONDARY TEACHERS

		STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
MORE THAN 19 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH	M	22.84	24.17	31.81	37.95	50.40
	SD	5.56	5.48	4.14	4.09	11.80
	N	37	35	36	38	37
LESS THAN 6 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH	M	24.65	23.12	33.79	39.38	51.59
	SD	5.16	5.41	4.51	4.16	16.02
	N	40	40	38	42	39

TABLE IX

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SCALES SEPARATELY FOR LESS EXPERIENCED (LESS THAN 6 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH) AND MORE EXPERIENCED (MORE THAN 19 YEARS TEACHING ENGLISH) SECONDARY TEACHERS[a]

	STANDARD ENGLISH	DEFINE AND EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	LINGUISTIC MATURITY	ANXIETY
STANDARD ENGLISH	1.00	.59	-.47	-.25	.49
DEFINE & EVALUATE WRITING TASKS	.63	1.00	-.37	-.51	.36
STUDENT SELF-EXPRESSION	-.34	-.30	1.00	.49	-.40
LINGUISTIC MATURITY	.39	.18	-.17	1.00	-.33
ANXIETY	-.12	-.15	.31	-.11	1.00

[a]NOTE - CORRELATIONS FOR LESS EXPERIENCED TEACHERS ARE ABOVE THE DIAGONAL AND CORRELATIONS FOR MORE EXPERIENCED TEACHERS ARE BELOW DIAGONAL